

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
April 23, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 10:00 am on April 23, 2014, in Room 362 of the Kolligian Library, Chair Ruth Mostern presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Mostern updated the committee on the following:

--UCORP. Main topics of discussion at recent UCORP meetings concerned the Portfolio Review Group (PRG) reports, specifically, the Multicampus Research Programs and Initiative (MRPI). UCORP believes it received a reasonable amount of data from the PRG and is supportive of PRG's overall findings and of MRPI.

--UCOLASC. The main topic of discussion was the open access policy, specifically, details about copyright. There is ambiguity surrounding copyrights for graduate students working as GSRs who publish work related to their GSR tenure, not dissertations. The California Digital Library and the UC General Counsel are aware of these complexities. There was also discussion at UCOLASC of the open access journal model that UC press is attempting to launch. The goal is to determine a financially viable model for a journal that does not over charge authors but still allows a journal to sustain itself and pay peer reviewers. While this project is still nascent, COR needs to be aware of it and is a further indication of the importance of having a standing Senate committee on Library and Scholarly Communications.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: Today's agenda and the April 9 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. AY 14-15 Senate Faculty Grants Criteria

COR members acknowledged that the main problem in awarding grants this year – as in past years – was the lack of adequate funding for all meritorious proposals. While the committee did the best it could with rating each

criterion, committee members want to draft a memo to next year's COR with guidance on how to establish next year's criteria.

The memo should also include the rationale on why this year's COR is recommending changes. One idea is to generate a form which all PIs are required to fill with the objective information that COR needs to make the objective components of the assessment more clear. Another possible suggestion for next year's COR is to change how the committee weighs each criterion.

A major suggestion for next year's COR is to split the pot of funding and allocate it proportionally to the number of faculty in each School. The proposals should be sent to the School executive committees who should compare the quality of proposals as they have the appropriate expertise. The School executive committees can then forward the proposals back to COR – with their rationale for assessment – who will apply the criteria and complete the final rankings. This would require COR finalizing its criteria in fall semester.

Other suggestions to include in next year's criteria is to encourage faculty to submit joint proposals, and make the criteria for past funding more restrictive in order to more appropriately weigh the amount of current start up funds.

To finish this year's process, the COR analyst will email the faculty as a whole with a brief statement of how many proposals COR received and funded as well as a general explanation of why many proposals were deemed ineligible.

COR members discussed the importance of sending another memo to Division Council and Provost Peterson, stating that funding for the Senate faculty grants must increase in proportion to the growth of faculty. COR submitted such a memo in February, but the new memo should point out that COR received a high number of meritorious proposals, many of which could not be funded due to the low amount of available funding.

ACTION: COR analyst will draft the memo to next year's COR with the aforementioned suggestions, the email to the faculty as a whole, and the funding request memo to Division Council. All memos will be circulated among COR members for review and approval.

IV. PRG Reports

Chair Mostern met with SNS Dean Juan Meza, who is the UC Merced representative to the PRG. Dean Meza related that the PRG was satisfied with the way the process was conducted and that consensus was easily reached on the merits of the programs under consideration for systemwide funding. It was also agreed that the MRPI is highly significant and underfunded relative to its impact. Chair Mostern has related this opinion to UCORP on behalf of COR. Chair Mostern also reiterated the importance of UC Merced naming a faculty representative to next year's PRG.

V. Campus Review Items

COR had no comments on the proposed revisions to the UCM Senate regulations. Committee members discussed the revised EECS graduate proposal and still have concerns with various components.

ACTION: COR analyst will draft both memos to the Senate Chair on behalf of the committee.

VI. Systemwide Review Items

COR had no comments on the proposed revisions to either APM 190 (Whistleblower Complaint Policy) or the Compendium.

ACTION: COR analyst will draft both memos to the Senate Chair on behalf of the committee.

Before the next meeting on May 7, COR member Chen will draft a brief statement on COR's request for clarification on indirect cost return. The statement will be circulated among COR members for review and approval and the committee analyst will forward to Vice Chancellors Reese and

Feitelberg. The Vice Chancellors will attend the first half hour of the May 7 meeting to discuss indirect cost return.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.

Attest: Ruth Mostern, Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Senior Analyst